I submit that this is a policy of disaster, that we are making the same mistake in this country, that we have created a system of dependence and reliance on social and welfare programs that leave people dependent, just like we have done in Haiti and we are doing in this Nation. And now we have a President going there to celebrate a victory. I tell you that he is going there to celebrate a policy of disaster and potential economic disaster.

So I ask my colleagues to join with me to express concern to the administration and other Members of Congress that we do something to create jobs and real opportunities not only in Haiti but also this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MENENDEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENSIGN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DOGGETT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TAX BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am from California, the wine country, but we celebrate Wente Brothers and we celebrate Concannon and Stoney Ridge and Sebastiani. But the whine you hear around here is spelled with an ''H,'' and it is the whine that the rich are getting more than they are entitled to and that we have to create another program for the poor, and we have to transfer money from this group to that group.

We have all of the whines and when we return Government to the people, the very people that gave us this Government, this democracy, we hear the whines. ''Oh, we are with you, but. We would be with you on the balanced budget, but there is no safeguard for Social Security.''

Where does Social Security go today? It goes to the U.S. Government, every cent of it. If we were going to steal it, we would steal it today. If we reduce the deficit, do we have more likely a need for Social Security or less likely? The answer is, if we balance this budget, we are less likely to impose on Social Security, but the ifs and the buts and the whining are endless.

Yesterday, we heard the fabulous whine, ''Oh, we are for term limits if you will make them retroactive.'' This was coauthored by a gentleman who has only served here 40 years, and he did it with a straight face.

Last week, ''We want to reform welfare but not if you consolidate the bureaucracies of the 16 different administrative arms serving food.'' But, ''Oh, you are going to cut food to the poor children and to the elderly.''

Well, we finally found out that the COLA is 4.3 percent rather than the 3.1 in the Clinton budget, and there is actually going to be more money down there to feed the poor people, but the starving bureaucrats will get a little thinner if welfare reform goes through, and it will.

Today, the Democrats, who had 40 years to fix the Tax Code, have discovered that people are going overseas to avoid the taxes, these same taxes that they spent 40 years creating. They have driven manufacturing overseas, and then they found out people are actually expatriating to avoid taxes.

In a bill which was created to extend the tax break for self-employed so they could buy health insurance, they wanted to tack on a tax on expatriates.

Well, folks, this was not the Omnibus Tax Bill of 1995. This was a bill to extend tax credits of 25 percent to the self-employed for last year so they can do their taxes by April 15 and to extend it to 30 percent next year.

Thanks to a great gentlewoman of this House, NANCY JOHNSON, we are going to go all the way to 100 percent by the time we are through, because people who own their own business ought to be able to do the same thing a large corporation can do and that is write off all of their health care.

Do not forget this came from the same gang that last year wanted to nationalize health care. They wanted the Government to take it over because it would become more efficient, because Government in Washington knows best.

No, folks, the whining continues. Next week, we are going to hear about the tax cuts of $500 per child are going to benefit the rich.

Now, we have got to use a little common sense here. Do all of the children belong to the rich? Did I miss something here or could we logically think to ourselves, without the help of Washington, that maybe it is young families that are having children, people on their way up, people who do not have all of the income in the world and have not a whole lot of savings because they are young? That is when we have our children.

This great financial institution known as Gannett published in their newspaper the following chart, and, lo and behold, just as you might have surmised, the young are having children, and they only make between $15,000 and $30,000. Twenty-eight percent of children and, therefore, 28 percent of the benefits are going to go to people under $30,000; 34.9 percent in addition to the 29 percent are going to those who make less than $50,000. That is with both parents working. Then under $75,000 add on another 23.1 percent and up to $100,000, 7.4 percent.

In other words, if you want to soak the rich and reduce the tax benefit to $95,000 and below, you are going to stick it to 5.3 percent of the people. That is the tax the rich folks that everybody is talking about and that leads us into the capital gains tax.

The capital gains tax, of course, is for the rich. Have you ever heard of a capital gains tax for the poor? People who have savings by buying a duplex may want to pass it on to their kids. They will not pay the capital gains tax because it is too high. They will wait to die.

According to the Wall Street Journal, there is over $7 trillion waiting for people to pass on, $7 trillion that would be unlocked if we reduced the capital gains tax.

That is what President John F. Kennedy did. That is what Ronald Reagan did. This tax cut for children is their own money, not a transfer from somebody else. We are giving them a credit to keep their own money.

We will see you next week for this debate, and we will help the families of America with the capital gains tax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HISTORIC VOTE ON TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held a historic vote on term limits. It is the first such vote